

REMARKS

Claims 15-45 are pending in the present application. No claims have been amended and no new matter has been added.

I. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

15, 19, 21, 26, 31, 36, and 41

Claims 15, 19, 21, 26, 31, 36, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Independent Recovery in Large-Scale Distributed Systems” written by Peter Triantafillou (Triantafillou) taken with “A System Prototype for Warehouse View Maintenance” written by Wiener et al. (Wiener). Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants note that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Further, the teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant’s disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 941 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (MPEP § 2143.03).

A. For claim 15, there are one or more claimed limitations that are not disclosed, taught or suggested by the cited references. Claim 15 recites the following limitations:

**selecting one or more of said database recovery logs to access;
establishing a view of said one or more database recovery logs;
insulating said view from a format of said one or more database recovery logs;
issuing a database statement to query said view; and
retrieving data from said one or more database recovery logs in response to said database statement.**

1. Claim 15 recites the limitations “selecting one or more of said database recovery logs to access; establishing a view of said one or more database recovery logs.”

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Triantafillou fails to disclose establishing a view of said one or more database recovery logs. The Office Action cites that page 3, section 2.2 and page 5, section 3.7 of Wiener allegedly discloses establishing a view of said one or more database recovery logs. The Office Action also asserts that Wiener proposed the use of a materialized view for system crash recoveries on page 7, column 2, paragraph 2. Applicants respectfully submit that Wiener does not teach or suggest establishing a view of ***a selected one or more database recovery logs.***

In contrast, Wiener is directed toward the implementation of a prototype to integrate data from distributed and autonomous sources for a warehouse. (Wiener, page 1, Introduction). Specifically, Wiener teaches an integration component responsible for collecting and maintaining the **materialized views of the source data of the warehouse.** (Wiener, page 1, Introduction). Wiener discloses that the integrator component may receive a table of source changes generated from the log of a data source in the data warehouse (e.g. IBM's log based monitor DataCapture, used with data source DB2, generates a table of source changes) in order to ensure that the source data relied upon for the view of the data warehouse has the most recent modifications. (Wiener, page 5, section 3.7). There is no suggestion in Wiener that a view be established for a database recovery log. Wiener's materialized view is of the source data contained in the warehouse that may reflects all recent modifications after a data integrator receives a table of source changes. Thus, Wiener's materialized view is of the source data of a warehouse and Wiener does not teach or suggest ***establishing a view of a selected one or more database recovery logs.***

As discussed above, the Office Action asserts that Wiener proposed the use of a materialized view for system crash recoveries on page 7, column 2, paragraph 2. However, the cited paragraph of Wiener states:

We are also designing algorithms for crash recovery; in order to recover from a crash, not only do all source and view definitions need to be persistent (they already are), but also all modifications currently being processed must be remembered and recovered. (Wiener, page 7, column 2, paragraph 2).

This section of Wiener does not propose or suggest using a materialized view for system crash recoveries as suggested by the Office Action. Instead, this section of Wiener is merely stating that if there is a materialized view, then the source and view definitions for the materialized view must be handled in a way to make them persistent. There is nothing in this section that teaches or suggests using a recovery log nor that a view is used for system crash recoveries. This section of Wiener is only directed toward the implementation and crash recovery of a materialized view for a warehouse, and does not disclose *establishing a view of a selected recovery log* of a database as presently claimed.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is allowable over Triantafillou taken with Wiener.

B. Claims 26 and 36 recite sufficiently the same limitations as claim 15, and therefore are patentable over Triantafillou taken with Wiener for the same reasons.

C. Claims 16-25 and 37-45 depend on claims 15, 26, and 36, and therefore, are patentable over Triantafillou taken with Wiener for at least the same reasons.

18, 20, 29, 30, 39, and 40

Claims 18, 20, 29, 30, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Triantafillou taken with Wiener as applied to claims 15, 19, 21, 26, 31, 36, and 41 above, and in further view of “Database Management Systems” written by Raghu Ramakrishnan (Ramakrishnan). Applicants respectfully traverse.

A. As indicated above, independent claims 15, 26, and 36, and their respective dependent claims are patentable over Triantafillou taken with Wiener. Applicants respectfully submit that Ramakrishnan is both not relied upon to disclose the limitation of establishing a view of a selected one or more database recovery logs of independent claims 15, 26, and 36, and does not disclose the deficiencies present in Triantafillou taken with Wiener. Ramakrishnan teaches using information in a log file to restart a system after a system crash. (Ramakrishnan, p. 529 and Figure 18.4). Specifically, Ramakrishnan discloses using the contents of the log file to allow for restoring the system that crashed in a series of phases. (Ramakrishnan, p. 529 and Figure 18.4) Ramakrishnan is silent with respect to establishing a view of a selected one or more recovery logs. Thus, Ramakrishnan does not disclose the limitation of establishing a view of a selected one or more database recovery logs.

CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, please contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

To the extent that any arguments and disclaimers were presented to distinguish prior art, or for other reasons substantially related to patentability, during the prosecution of any and all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all such arguments and disclaimers, and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7011443001. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Bingham McCutchen's Deposit Account No. 50-2518, referencing billing number 7011443001.

Respectfully submitted,
Bingham McCutchen LLP

Dated: April 11, 2007

By: Gerald Chan
Gerald Chan
Reg. No. 51,541

Bingham McCutchen LLP
Three Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (650) 849-4960
Facsimile: (650) 849-4800